



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,341	11/27/2001	Cecily Anne Snyder	020313-001810US	1973
20350 7590 03/09/2007 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER MEINECKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3694	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	03/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/996,341
Filing Date: November 27, 2001
Appellant(s): SNYDER, CECILY ANNE

MAILED

MAR 09 2007

GROUP 3600

William J. Daley (Reg. No. 52,471)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 26, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed August 10, 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,859,806	KAMAREI et al.	2-2005
7,016,852	LEE	3-2006

(9) Grounds of Rejection

Art Unit: 3694

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 2, and 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kamarei et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,859,806).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamarei et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,859,806), as applied to claim 1 above.

Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamarei et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,859,806), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 7,016,852).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, and 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kamarei et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,859,806).

Kamarei discloses a computer-implemented method of generating a message for a first intellectual property case, the method comprising:

[Claim 1] storing information related to a plurality of intellectual property cases on a computer-readable medium, the plurality of intellectual property cases including the first

Art Unit: 3694

intellectual property case (col. 5, lines 19-31 – Docketed cases are related to cases filed with a governmental office, such as a patent or trademark office; col. 6, line 49 – Case Listing Database; col. 10, lines 6-10 – Cases can be searched for and retrieved from a Case Listing Database, which implies that there are a plurality of cases stored), wherein storing information related to the first intellectual property case comprises storing the information related to the first intellectual property case in a case data unit, wherein the case data unit stores data related to the intellectual property case and one or more documents related to the first intellectual property case (Fig. 6; col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9; Kamarei specifically states that “the Governmental System appends an electronic document, in ASCII, Word Perfect, MS Word, GIF, JPG, PDF, or any other type of format to the Docket Request Message.” (Col. 10, lines 64-67) Furthermore, various documents may be generated in relation to a case (col. 11, lines 40-67; col. 13, lines 55-63). The docket request messages are case specific, have related documents, and are managed as a case data unit by a case management system (as seen in Fig. 6); therefore, Kamarei’s case data unit stores data related to the intellectual property case and one or more documents related to the first intellectual property case);

receiving a signal indicating occurrence of an event related to the first intellectual property case (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9);

responsive to receiving the signal, identifying one or more rules associated with the event (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9);

identifying at least a first rule from the one or more rules based upon filter criteria information associated with the one or more rules and based upon information related to the first intellectual property case stored on the computer-readable medium (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9);

generating at least one message using the at least first rule, the message identifying an action to be performed in response to the event and identifying a date associated with the action (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9); and

communicating the at least one message to a first designated client system (col. 9, line 64 through col. 10, line 2);

[Claim 2] wherein the plurality of intellectual property cases includes patent cases and the first intellectual property case is a patent application case (col. 9, lines 6-10 – The case may be related to patent prosecution);

[Claim 5] wherein the signal indicating occurrence of the event related to the first intellectual property case is generated responsive to a change in the information related to the first intellectual property case (col. 12, lines 1-34);

[Claim 6] wherein identifying the at least first rule from the one or more rules based upon the filter criteria information comprises:

determining a set of rules from the one or more rules associated with the event, wherein a rule from the one or more rules is included in the set of rules if the filter criteria associated with the rule is satisfied by the information related to the first

Art Unit: 3694

intellectual property case, the set of rules including the at least first rule (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9);

[Claim 7] wherein the plurality of intellectual property cases includes patent cases and the first intellectual property case is a patent application case; and

the filter criteria associated with each rule in the one or more rules comprises a criterion related to filing status of a patent case, a criterion related to a type of the patent case, and a criterion related to priority information for a patent case (Fig. 6; col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9);

[Claim 8] wherein generating the at least one message using the at least first rule comprises:

determining an action associated with the at least first rule (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9);

determining a date generation formula associated with the action and a base date used by the date generation formula (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9);

applying the date generation formula to the base data to generate the date associated with the action (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9); and

including information indicating the action associated with the at least first rule and the date generated by applying the date generation formula in the at least one message (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9);

Art Unit: 3694

[Claim 9] wherein communicating the at least one message to the first designated client system comprises:

determining one or more users associated with the first intellectual property case from information related to the first intellectual property case (col. 9, line 64 through col. 10, line 2);

from the one or more users, determining a first user who is designated to receive the at least one message generated using the first rule (col. 9, line 64 through col. 10, line 2);

communicating the at least one message to a system used by the first user (col. 9, line 64 through col. 10, line 2);

[Claim 10] wherein communicating the at least one message to the system used by the first user comprises:

sending an electronic mail message to first user, the electronic mail message including the at least one message (col. 9, line 64 through col. 10, line 2).

[Claims 11-20] Claims 11-20 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

It should be noted that Kamarei uses a processor and memory to perform the recited functionality (col. 5, lines 19-31; col. 5, line 41; col. 6, lines 38-57).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 3694

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamarei et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,859,806), as applied to claim 1 above.

[Claim 3] Kamarei teaches that the plurality of intellectual property cases includes trademark cases (col. 9, lines 6-10), yet Kamarei does not expressly teach that the cases may be copyright cases. However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known in the art of intellectual property to prosecute copyright cases. Kamarei is open to managing various types of transactions with governmental systems (col. 5, lines 26-28) and copyrights are obtained through a government office, such as the U.S. Copyright Office; therefore, the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to adapt Kamarei to assist in the management of copyright dockets in order to expand the marketability of Kamarei's invention, thereby increasing the likelihood for profit.

Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamarei et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,859,806), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 7,016,852).

[Claim 21] While Kamarei stores case-related documents (as discussed above), Kamarei does not expressly teach that the one or more documents comprise one or

more documents selected from the group consisting of: an invention disclosure, a filed patent application, a patent drawing, an old version of a patent application, an office action, and a response to an office action; however, the differences in the types of documents are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements; therefore, such differences do not effectively serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP § 2106. Nevertheless, Lee discloses a docket management system that formats and stores documents (e.g., documents to be filed with an intellectual property office, such as the specification, claims, abstract, and drawings of a patent application) (col. 7, lines 1-5, 18-67). Both Kamarei and Lee are directed toward intellectual property docket management systems; therefore, the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Kamarei such that the one or more documents comprise one or more documents selected from the group consisting of: an invention disclosure, a filed patent application, a patent drawing, an old version of a patent application, an office action, and a response to an office action in order to facilitate more efficient and rapid collaboration among various parties in an effort to

Art Unit: 3694

transact with an intellectual property office (which is a general goal of both Kamarei, as seen in col. 4, lines 39-54, and Lee, as seen in col. 3, lines 17-64).

Regarding claims 22 and 23, Kamarei does not expressly teach the steps of storing the one or more documents comprising storing each document as part of a document entity that comprises the document and a set of meta-data about the document (claim 22), wherein the set of meta-data about the document comprises one or more data elements selected from the group consisting of a document ID, a document type, an originator, a status, a security profile, a file format, a creation date, a last modified date, a set of physical file attributes, a set of search field key words, a completion date, and a list of witness names (claim 23) and scanning a paper to produce a scanned document in a computer readable format, wherein storing one or more documents comprises storing the scanned document (claim 24). However, Lee discloses that the documents may be scanned (col. 11, lines 18-21; col. 13, lines 4-7) and stored in a format that defines the document's meta-data corresponding to the document's physical file attributes and file format (col. 12, lines 12-36). Again, both Kamarei and Lee are directed toward intellectual property docket management systems; therefore, the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Kamarei to perform the steps of storing the one or more documents comprising storing each document as part of a document entity that comprises the document and a set of meta-data about the document (claim 22), wherein the set of meta-data about the document comprises one or more data elements selected from the group consisting of a document ID, a

document type, an originator, a status, a security profile, a file format, a creation date, a last modified date, a set of physical file attributes, a set of search field key words, a completion date, and a list of witness names (claim 23) and scanning a paper to produce a scanned document in a computer readable format, wherein storing one or more documents comprises storing the scanned document (claim 24) in order to facilitate more efficient and rapid collaboration among various parties in an effort to transact with an intellectual property office (which is a general goal of both Kamarei, as seen in col. 4, lines 39-54, and Lee, as seen in col. 3, lines 17-64). Also, Lee implies that scanning documents facilitates the collaborative approval of documentation and submission thereof to an appropriate intellectual property office (col. 11, lines 7-21; col. 13, lines 2-21), which would be advantageous to Kamarei's intellectual property docket management system for the same reasons since both Lee and Kamarei are ultimately concerned with the goal of efficiently and quickly performing transactions with an intellectual property office.

Additionally, as per claim 25, neither Kamarei nor Lee expressly teaches the step of subjecting the scanned document to optical character recognition to recognize data from one or more fields from the scanned document, wherein storing the data related to the intellectual property case comprises storing the recognized data in the case data unit; however, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known in the art of document scanning to scan documents using optical character recognition. The use of optical character recognition allows one to more easily extract a desired subset of data from the scanned document. Since the Kamarei-Lee combination addresses the storage and

Art Unit: 3694

scanning of intellectual property related documents, the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the Kamarei-Lee combination to perform the step of subjecting the scanned document to optical character recognition to recognize data from one or more fields from the scanned document, wherein storing the data related to the intellectual property case comprises storing the recognized data in the case data unit in order to allow one to more easily extract a desired subset of data from the scanned document, which can be especially useful when filing patent applications and related documents electronically.

Regarding claim 26, Kamarei teaches the step of receiving a signal indicating occurrence of an event related to the first intellectual property case (col. 8, line 45 through col. 9, line 2; col. 9, line 32 through col. 10, line 9), yet Kamarei does not expressly teach that the signal indicating occurrence of the event related to the first intellectual property case is generated responsive to the recognized data. However, Kamarei's event reminders may be related to events that require the filing of a document (as seen from the types of actions shown in Fig. 8). If a reminder to file a document is generated (as seen in Kamarei) and documents needed to pursue patent prosecution are scanned (as seen in the Kamarei-Lee combination), the Examiner submits that the scanning of required documents would obviously allow one to respond to the types of actions shown in Fig. 8 of Kamarei. For example, if an affidavit is due, this implies that a document containing an affidavit needs to be filed. Therefore, the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to further modify the Kamarei-Lee combination such

that the signal indicating occurrence of the event related to the first intellectual property case is generated responsive to the recognized data in order to more efficiently provide reminders to file required documents related to an event reminder when these documents become available.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argues that "Kamarei fails to teach a case data unit that stores one or more documents related to an intellectual property case. Instead, Kamarei merely teaches the storage of docketing information, along with triggering associated reminders and deadlines." (Page 8 of the Appeal Brief) The Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, it should be noted that Appellant specifically refers to the step of "storing information related to a plurality of intellectual property cases on a computer-readable medium, the plurality of intellectual property cases including the first intellectual property case, wherein storing information related to the first intellectual property case comprises storing the information related to the first intellectual property case in a case data unit, wherein the case data unit stores data related to the first intellectual property case and one or more documents related to the first intellectual property case." (Claim 1) The particular type of information stored is never utilized for any purpose that specifically requires this type of information. These differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements; therefore, such differences do not effectively serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the

structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability as the claimed invention fails to present a new and unobvious functional relationship between the descriptive material and the substrate, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994)); *In re Ngai*, 367 F.3d 1336, 1336, 70 USPQ2d 1862, 1863-64 (Fed. Cir. 2004); MPEP § 2106.

Additionally, the stored data is merely “related to” the first intellectual property case. By Appellant’s own assertion, “Kamarei merely teaches the storage of docketing information, along with triggering associated reminders and deadlines” and “[a]s Kamarei discloses, ‘[t]he Action Prompt 30 and Action Prompt Due Date (Not shown) provide the vehicle for notifying users of a Client System of the type of action that needs to be taken in the governmental proceeding and the time that such action should be taken, or a reminder in advance of the time an action should be taken.’... Clearly, the Action Prompt is merely a reminder system and has nothing to do with the storage of documents.” (Page 8 of the Appeal Brief) Even, if as Appellant asserts, Kamarei is nothing more than a reminder system, Figures 6-8 of Kamarei clearly show that a user sets up various reminders that can be added and/or updated in relation to a particular case, which means that such reminder information is stored in relation to its respective case. These reminders are indicative of information (e.g., deadlines) “related to” (i.e., “associated with” or “linked to”) a plurality of intellectual property cases; therefore, the stored reminders themselves address the limitation in question. (The fact that a case is

identified by case number and application number, as seen in Figure 8, as well as the fact that a "New Case" option is provided, as seen in Figure 7, imply that there are a plurality of cases to be managed.)

Additionally, the limitation "wherein the case data unit stores data related to the first intellectual property case and one or more documents related to the first intellectual property case" can be interpreted as "wherein the case data unit stores data related to the first intellectual property case and data related to one or more documents related to the first intellectual property case." Again, the reminders are associated with/linked to/related to case-specific information, such as due dates for documents (e.g., see "Appeal," "Affidavit Due," "Power of Attorney," and "Priority Documents" in Figure 6).

Furthermore, the Examiner submits that Kamarei does store actual documents related to a plurality of intellectual property cases. Notably, the storing step (e.g., of claim 1) does not specify where such information is stored (beyond the fact that it is stored in a computer-readable medium). Kamarei incorporates action prompts to search for a document (col. 8, line 63), which also suggests the existence of a document related to a given case. Also, Kamarei specifically states that "the Governmental System appends an electronic document, in ASCII, Word Perfect, MS Word, GIF, JPG, PDF, or any other type of format to the Docket Request Message." (Col. 10, lines 64-67) Furthermore, various documents may be generated in relation to a case (col. 11, lines 40-67; col. 13, lines 55-63). The docket request messages are case specific, have related documents, and are managed as a case data unit by a case management system (as seen in Fig. 6); therefore, Kamarei's case data unit stores data

Art Unit: 3694

related to the intellectual property case and one or more documents related to the first intellectual property case. As a matter of fact, claims 1, 8, and 9 of Kamarei set forth how a docket request message is used to access information related to a selected legal case (which, in light of col. 5, lines 26-27 and Figures 6-8, is understood to be an intellectual property case). Then, Kamarei's claim 8 brings in "a document generation step wherein any one or combination of the following documents are created by the host server system using information contained in the case listing database; legal documents, action prompt reports, action prompt due date reports, client system defined forms, and client system defined letters." Kamarei's claims 9 and 12 clarify how the document may be prepared automatically and generated in response to defined search parameters and claim 14 recites that "the document is electronically forwarded to any one or combination of the following; the client system, a Government System, a third party designated by the client system." This case-related document must be stored at some point (even if only temporarily) in order to be created and forwarded electronically. Additionally, claim 1 of Kamarei recites that the action prompt and computerized action prompt due date for the legal case selected by the client system are recorded (i.e., stored). As seen in Kamarei's claim 8, case-related action prompt reports and action prompt due date reports are documents that may be generated. Since the information from these reports is stored (as seen in claim 1) and can be accessed or updated by users (as seen in the reports displayed in Figures 6-8), these reports also serve as examples of one or more documents related to the first intellectual property case that are stored in a case data unit (as recited in Appellant's claim 1).

Art Unit: 3694

In conclusion, Appellant arguments are not persuasive.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


Susanna M. Diaz
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3694

Conferees:


James Trammell
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3694


Robert Weinhardt
Business Practice Specialist
Technology Center 3600